[2nd August 1933

Commerce

Representation by the Malabar Chamber of Commerce in regard to the import of Japanese rice.

* 80 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) what representation has been made to the Government by the Malabar Chamber of Commerce in regard to the attempted import of Japanese rice into the West Coast; and

(*b*) what action has been taken by the Government in the matter?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) No representation has been received by the Government.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—"Was any inquiry made by the Government in regard to this matter?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"I do not think. No, Sir, Government have not made any enquiry."

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—"May I know whether the Government will be pleased to make an enquiry?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"Government will consider the suggestion."

B. POCKER SAHIB Bahadur:—"Has the Government come to know, Sir, that Japanese rice is being imported?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"No, Sir."

Provincial Finance

Extent of savings due to revised scales of pay.

* 81 *Q.*—Mr. M. S. SRESHTA: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state what saving there will be in the current year by reason of the introduction of the revised scales of pay for the provincial services?

A.—The savings in the current year will be practically 'nil' in view of the fact that the Government have, in deference to the views of the hon. Members of the Legislative Council expressed in the debate on the revision of salaries on 11th March 1933 allowed the following concessions, which will enable a large number of officers, the scales of pay of whose posts have been revised, to continue on the existing scales:—

(1) Every officer who was in the service of Government before 15th August 1931 in a substantive, officiating or temporary capacity shall be entitled to the existing scales of pay in respect of any post which he holds or may hold, if he had held such post whether in a substantive, officiating or temporary capacity or had been a probationer therefor at any time before 13th April 1933, irrespective of any break in his tenure of such post.

(2) Officers who were not in service on 15th August 1931 will draw the difference between their pay in the old scale on 13th April 1933 and that in the new scale as a personal pay to be absorbed in increments.

Mr. M. S. SRESHTA:—" May I know whether the members of Provincial Services will lose considerably in their prospects by reason of the revision of the scales of salary? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" In the sense that they will not get as much as they used to get."

Mr. M. S. SRESHTA:—" Is it proposed to pay any compensation to the members of the Provincial Services for the loss of their prospects? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" People who will be affected by the reduction will be the new entrants."

Mr. M. S. SRESHTA:—" Even with regard to the old entrants when they get promoted they have got to enter on the revised scale? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" They will have to in some cases."

Mr. M. S. SRESHTA:—" In that case will the Government consider the desirability of paying compensation for the loss of prospects of these members of the Provincial Services? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—" No, Sir."

Local Self-Government

Collection of taxes on motor vehicles.

* 82 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) the amount of provincial taxation on motor vehicles collected in each district last year; and

(*b*) the amount of toll compensation paid to each district board last year?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) A statement[a] is laid on the table of the House.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—" In the appendix I find that in the case of Ganjam a compensation of Rs. 51,970 has been paid as against a tax collection of Rs. 58,316 while in the case of Vizagapatam only Rs. 87,500 has been given as against a collection of Rs. 1,48,554. May I know the principle on which this distribution was made? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" Sir, the amounts were fixed according to the income each district realized at the time of the passing of the Motor Vehicles Act. I believe that part of the difference is due to the fact that the first column includes amounts paid to municipalities."

[a] Printed as Appendix V on page 250 infra.